

Remarks/Arguments:

Summary of Changes Made

By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 8 and 17 have been amended, and claim 2 has been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5, 7-9 and 13-19 remain in the application.

Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the functioning clock is removably mounted to a front side of the connecting portion of the hub so as to conceal lug nuts tightened down on the lug studs from view when the wheel assembly is viewed from a front plan perspective, as shown in Figs. 2, 6 and 7 of the application. This added claim language is intended to remove any doubt or ambiguity regarding the direction of view.

Claim 1 has further been amended to specify that at least a face portion of the functioning clock does not rotate with the hub when the rear side of the central portion of the hub is mounted against an axel hub of a motor vehicle and the hub is rotating. This added limitation is similar in some respects to the limitation previously set forth in claim 2, but does not include the "orientation" language, which the Examiner stated could be construed as meaning that the face portion merely remains oriented within the space defined as the central portion of the hub. Support for additional limitation to claim 1 can be found in paragraphs [0029] and [0030] of the specification.

Claims 3, 4 and 8 have been amended to depend from claim 1 rather than claim 2, which has been canceled. Claim 17, which was allowed in the prior Office Action, has been amended to correct two typographical errors. No new matter has been added to the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

In the prior Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown, U.S. Pat. No. 4,793,658, in view of Adkins, GB 2 265 585. As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to specify that at least a face portion of the functioning clock does not rotate with the hub when the rear side of the

central portion of the hub is mounted against an axel hub of a motor vehicle and the hub is rotating. Applicants note that this limitation is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Brown or Adkins, alone or in combination.

Brown teaches a wheel cover that can be mounted to the central portion of the hub of a motor vehicle to conceal the lug holes from view. The wheel cover according to Brown, which does not include a functioning clock, rotates with the hub when the hub is rotating.

Adkins does not teach attaching a functioning clock to the connecting portion of a wheel assembly. On the contrary, Adkins teaches mounting a functioning clock kit to a wheel cover for a motor vehicle, and then mounting the wheel cover to a "mounting means" that is not a hub of a wheel assembly for a motor vehicle. Applicants note that if one were to attach the clock kit to a wheel cover as shown in Adkins, and then mount the wheel cover to a hub of a wheel assembly for a motor vehicle (which is not taught by Adkins) such as shown in Brown, the face portion of the functioning clock would rotate with the hub contrary to the limitations presently included in claim 1. There are no prior art references of record that would fairly, teach, suggest or disclose mounting a functioning clock to a front side of a connecting portion of a hub of a wheel assembly for a motor vehicle such that at least a face portion of the functioning clock does not rotate with the hub when the rear side of the central portion of the hub is mounted against an axel hub of a motor vehicle and the hub is rotating. Applicants submit the claim 1, as amended, is clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 3-5, 7-9, 13-16 and 19 each depend from claim 1, either directly or through an intervening claim. Such claims are patentable over the prior art of record for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over such art. The prior rejections of claims 3-5, 7-9, 13-16 and 19 are considered moot in view of the amendments to claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 17 and 18 were allowed in the prior Office Action. Claim 17 has been amended to correct two minor typographical errors.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK, L.L.P.



Randolph E. Digges, III
Reg. No. 40,590

925 Euclid Avenue
Suite 700
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1405
(216) 566-9700